(16)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH

SINGLE BENCH: HON'BLE SHRI S.R. NAYAK, CJ.

WRIT PETITION NO.1629 OF 2006

PETITIONER		Anuradha Kushari aged about 24 years S/o Utpal Kushari R/o Vidya Nagar, Dist. Bilaspur (C.G.)
	Vs.	
RESPONDENTS	1.	Vice Chancellor, Guru Ghasi Das University, Bilaspur (C.G.)
	2.	The Controller Guru Ghasi Das University, Bilaspur (C.G.)
	3.	The Principal, C.M.D. PG College Bilaspur (C.G.)

Present: Smt. Renu Kochar, learned counsel for the petitioner.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 5th April, 2006)

The petitioner – student having secured lower percentage of marks in the subjects of American Literature and Poetry in M.A. (Final) English examination held in the year 2005 and thinking that her answer-scripts in the above two subjects were not properly valued, applied to the University for revaluation in terms of regulation. The University having revalued the petitioner's answer-scripts in the above two subjects and without finding any change in the marks even after the revaluation, issued an endorsement to the petitioner and similarly circumstanced certain others which reads, "no change". Hence, this writ petition by the aggrieved petitioner-student.

(2) The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the endorsement issued by the University merely stating that "there is no change" would create a serious doubt as to whether the University had in fact revalued the answer-scripts of the petitioner in the subjects of

(17)

American Literature and Poetry properly, because, those subjects are not mentioned in the endorsement. I think that the above contention is technical, if not hyper-technical. The endorsement issued by the University has to be understood in the context of the facts of the case. The petitioner has applied for revaluation of answer-scripts in the subjects of American Literature and Poetry, and with reference to those subjects endorsement is issued and, therefore, that endorsement is intended to tell the petitioner – student that even after the revaluation of the answer-scripts in the above subjects, there is no change in the marks. That is the only reasonable and fair way of understanding the endorsement. No ground is made out for interference. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Chief Justice